GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

I. Statement of the General Principles of a Bill to Amend the Mysore District Board's Regulation.

Grant of House-Building Advances to Employees of District Boards and Municipal Councils.

The committee appointed to revise the Municipal Account Manual having recommended in 1924 that employees of Municipal Councils and Local Boards might be granted house-building advances from the funds of the local bodies, Government in their Order No. 2298—L.B. 80-24-1, dated 15th September 1924, approved of the recommendation and directed that action be taken to amend the Municipal and Local Boards Regulations accordingly.

2. The question was included in a memorandum placed before the Representative Assembly in October 1924. The Assembly was, however, not in favour of the grant of the advances and pending further consideration, the order of 15th September 1924 was withdrawn. (*Vide* Government Order No. 5607-27—Ml. 26-24-27, dated 2nd February 1925.)

3. The District Board of Tumkur have since recommended the grant of a house-building advance to a reserve Sanitary Inspector and propose withdrawal of the existing restrictions and are of opinion that the Municipal and District Boards Regulations may be amended so as to permit of advances for house-building being given to employees of Local Boards from the funds of the local bodies concerned. It may be noted that Local Boards and Municipal Councils in the Madras Presidency have been permitted to grant at their discretion advances to their servants to purchase or build houses on terms similar to those applicable to such advances made to Government servants.

4. The question of such advances being made by local bodies in the State is therefore again placed before the Representative Assembly for ascertaining its opinion as to whether the District Boards and Municipal Regulations should be amended so as to give this power to the local bodies.

THE LEGAL REMEMBRANCER TO GOVERNMENT explained the main principles of the Bill.

KHAN BAHADUR MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN said that the measure was opposed to the principles of local self-government. The purpose for which taxes, etc., were levied in local areas was for the provision of amenities for the

common good of the people concerned, and the grant of house-building advances would only benefit one portion of them, *viz.*, the employees of the local bodies. He added that there were also practical difficulties in the way of collecting the dues from the employees, as they were liable to be transferred to other local bodies or to Government departments. Local bodies were generally not very well off, financially, and there was no likelihood of a large number of them being in a position to sanction loans. There were, besides, several more urgent wants of the people which could not be provided, for want of funds, for instance, the introduction of the scheme of compulsory primary education. There was also no guarantee that if such a scheme was agreed to, only deserving applicants would get the advances, because any applicant who canvassed and brought round the Councillors was sure to get them.

He did not see any point in the argument that such advances were given by local bodies in Madras and therefore the same thing should be done here. Conditions were different in the two cases. If, therefore, Government were particular about helping employees of local bodies, they could as well set apart a sum of money for the purpose themselves. By sanctioning such advances, the local bodies would be considerably inconvenienced because they would have to continue a man in service, even though he proved to be incompetent or dishonest, simply because of the instalments that might still be due from him to the Municipality. He added that there were any number of houses available and the municipal employees could get them easily.

MR. SATYANARAYANA CHETTY agreed with the above view.

MR. G. B. RAGHAVENDRACHAR also agreed with the observations of Khan Bahadur Mahomed Abbas Khan and added that there were enough co-operative societies and other similar institutions to help any one requiring financial aid for the construction of houses and that the employees of local and municipal bodies might avail themselves of the help of these institutions.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASIENGAR, however, expressed surprise that the non-official President of the premier City Muncipality should be opposed to such a beneficent measure which really implied an extension of the principles of local self-government. If the work of the local bodies must go on smoothly, it was necessary that their employees should be kept contented by affording them certain facilities. It was

quite possible to lay down sufficient safeguards to see that the moneys advanced would not be lost to the local bodies.

MR. L. VEMA REDDY was not aware of any general inconvenience experienced by the employees of the local bodies by reason of the want of houses of their own, and that action on the lines proposed should be taken only if the majority of local bodies felt that such a provision was called for. There was no additional advantage to be derived by the employees by these advances because they would have to pay in the shape of instalments and interest a sum equivalent at least to what they were paying in the shape of house rent. There were also instances of loans of various kinds being obtained but not utilised for the purpose for which they were sanctioned. He was therefore opposed to the proposed measure, at least for some time to come.

MR. B. L. BYANNA in supporting the measure observed that it was but just that local bodies provided for their own employees as many of the facilities as were afforded by Government to their employees as possible, more especially as the servants of local bodies were interchangeable with those of Government. It could not be said that all the local bodies were subjected to financial stringency, and even if the measure was passed, these bodies retained full discretion as to whether or not advances should be sanctioned.

MR. P. SUBBARAMA SETTY regretted that Khan Bahadur Mahomed Abbas Khan should have said that Municipal Councillors would allow themselves to be influenced by personal appeals of applicants for house-building advances. As regards the availability of houses he said that generally speaking, bungalows or big houses were available but it was always difficult to secure houses on cheap rent, and this was the reason why the scheme of providing houses for the poor in Bangalore City had proved very popular. He added that the difficulties referred to by some of the previous speakers were not real, and so he appealed to the members to support the measure.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH expressed himself in opposition to the measure and said that he was also not so sure that these advances always helped the really deserving men.

MR. S. N. M. RAZVI strongly pleaded for support to the proposed measure and said that by passing it the members would enable local bodies to provide not only

their own employees but their children and children's children with the most essential requirement, *viz.*, dwelling places.

MR. C. NARASIMHAIYA said that when the same proposal was brought up in the Assembly once before, it was thrown out because at that time municipal service was not pensionable and could be terminated at any time. But under the existing conditions when service under Government and under local bodies was interchangeable, there was nothing which could justify the measure being rejected. It was not possible for one and the same employee to obtain advances in every place where he worked, and arrangement could be easily made for the deduction of instalments due, wherever the employee remained. There might, he said, come a time when even Village Panchayets would like to sanction house-building advances to their employees. If local bodies had not funds enough, he thought that it was better to ask for aid from Government than to reject the measure itself.

MR. B. S. RANOJI RAO strongly supported the proposal. He repeated the arguments urged by Mr. Belur Srinivasiengar. With regard to Mr. Sanjeeviah's observation that really deserving men did not get the advances, he said that if that was true, it was the mistake of those that granted them. If local bodies wanted to give advances, and if they had the money required, they might disburse them in instalments, with reference to the work already executed by the applicants. As regards security, he said that if the advances were for the purchase of houses, there were the houses themselves, and if it be for building the houses, there would be the sites, then the pension, then the life insurance, from which any dues not paid back by the applicants could easily be recovered. He concluded by saying that this was a measure which the representatives of the people themselves should have asked for, and that it was their duty to thank the Government for the initiative taken by them.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH observed that if practical effect to the proposal should be given, local bodies might require very large sums of money. He did not believe that the complaint about want of houses was general and said that unless and until the essential requirements such as a proper drainage, sufficient drinking water wells, roads, etc., were provided, it was not desirable for local bodies to embark on a scheme of granting house-building advances.

MR. B. ABDUR RAHMON was in favour of the measure.

He informed the house that the District Board of Bangalore had resolved a number of times in favour of granting house-building advances and thought that other District Boards might also have passed similar resolutions. Although the difficulty of securing houses in large cities like Bangalore and Mysore might not be great, he knew that the same thing could not be said of the taluks. As regards the fears expressed by some members that the advances might not be repaid at all if municipal employees were transferred from place to place, he said that there would be sufficient securities obtained beforehand. If this measure was not agreed to, the officials would have to borrow from outside, paying exorbitant rates of interest. He therefore appealed for the whole-hearted support of the members to the measure.

MR. PAPANNA of Nanjangud was of opinion that it was not difficult for officials in the Mysore State to find suitable houses for them and that it was not desriable that the local bodies should be dragged into debt, having to give advances to their employees.

MR. GURUMURTHIACHAR agreed with Mr. Vema Reddy that this question might be deferred till a recommendation in this behalf was made by the local bodies themselves and till other necessary wants were supplied to the people concerned.

MR. KESAVAIYA supported the measure. He said that even in towns where new extensions had been laid out, the sites remained vacant for want of adequate building facilities. It might be that some Municipalities had not enough funds for giving advances, but there were others which could easily afford to give them. As full discretion was allowed to local bodies to grant the advances or not, he said that there was no harm in passing the measure.

MR. NAGAPPA SETTY also agreed with the above view.

MR. E. KRISHNAPPA said that the local bodies should as far as possible provide for their employees advantages such as were provided by the Government to their subordinates. Otherwise, officials lent by Government might in future refuse to serve under the Local Boards. Municipal employees could not obtain loans from co-operative societies as they were not in a position to furnish any immovable security which was always insisted upon. He therefore supported the measure.

MR. B. SRINIVASIENGAR of Anekal thought that there was no risk in agreeing to give the advances.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that Government had not anticipated that there would be such a long discussion on this question. They had not expressed an opinion of their own in the matter, and the principles of the Bill embodied the recommendation of the Local Self-Government Conference, at which were represented all the District Boards and Municipalites. Applications had been received subsequent to the holding of that Conference, and before these were disposed of, Government desired to consult the Assembly and obtain an expression of its views in the matter. The First Member added that he did not see any danger in passing the measure, because the local bodies were free to take any safeguards that were necessary to secure the amounts advanced. It was necessary, he observed, to see that better houses sprang up in the towns and villages, and this object could be achieved if the local bodies that could spare funds, gave such advances.

The principles of the Bill were then put to vote and carried, 70 members voting for and 65 against.

After the result of the voting was declared, some of the members challenged its accuracy. After some discussion, THE DEWAN agreed to put the motion to vote a second time, when the following result was recorded:—

For 92; Against 113.

The motion was thereupon declared lost.

A poll having been demanded, the following division was recorded:—

The following members voted in favor of the Bill:—

	Messrs.		Messrs.
1.	M. Venkatakrishnaiya	18.	Belur Srinivasiengar
2.	C. Narasimhaiya	19.	K. Rame Gowda
3.	B. Narasinga Rao	20.	B. S. Ranoji Rao
4.	M. Ramaswami	21.	B. Srinivasiengar
5.	C. Subba Rao	22.	Gopalachar
6.	P. S. Ramaswami Iyengar	23.	B. C. Rangappa
7.	P. Sitaramaiah	24.	Rangaswamiengar
8.	B. Kesaviah	25.	M. Subba Rao
9.	G. B. Raghavendrachar	26.	Sankariah
10.	S. Krishnaswami Rao	27.	T. Ramachandra Rao
11.	H. V. Hanumantha Setty	28.	K. T. Seshaiya
12.	M. Subba Rao	29.	E. Krishnappa
13.	N. Surappa	30.	P. Nanjappa
14.	Venkatasami Gowda	31.	Devi Kariappa
15.	K. Ramakrishna Iyer	32.	K. T. Bhashyam Iyengar
16.	S. N. M. Razvi	33.	D. Devappa Wadiyar
17.	Bhaskariah	34.	B. Venkatasubbiah

Messrs.

35. S. Surappa
36. Suryanarayanappa
37. B. Appaiyanna
38. M. Rame Gowda
39. Nanjiah Setty
40. K. S. K. Sabapathy Iyer
41. Anjaneya Setty
42. Venkatagiriah
43. A. N. Venkoba Rao
44. Bhaskara Rao
45. H. Gubbiah
46. Ramanna Gowda
47. Dakappa
48. Siddalingadevaru
49. Veeranna Gowda
50. Savandiah
51. Sidde Gowda
52. V. M. Rudrappa
53. Paul Raju
54. N. Viraraj Urs
55. B L. Byanna
56. M. S. Linge Gowda
57. Shampur Papanna
58. B. Abdur Rahmon
59. B. C. Rangappa
60. Nanje Gowda
61. M. Subba Rao

Messrs.

62. Bandiah
63. A. Shrikantappa
64. A. V. Venkatasubbiah
65. Rangasami Setti
66. C. Subba Rao
67. Sanjeeviah
68. K. Suraiya
69. Mannaji Rao Kadom
70. T. S. Ali Khan
71. P. Subbaramia Chetty
72. Y. Srinivasiengar
73. M. V. Ramalingaiah
74. P. Nagarajiah
75. A. Narayanaiengar
76. Nagappa Setty
77. Salar Khan
78. Satyanarayana Setty
79. B. Rangiengar
80. Jatru Naik
81. Kariyanna
82. N. G. Lakshminarayana Reddy
83. V. Sreenivasachar
84. M. P. Somasekhara Rao
85. Lakshminaranappa
86. Rameswara Sastry
87. Chandrabhan Singh
88. Venkatasubbaiya

and 4 others.

List of members who voted against the Bill.

Messrs.

1. Gurumurtiacharya
2. Siddabasappa
3. Basappa Gowda
4. Halappa
5. Rudrappa
6. Srikantappa
7. Venkataramane Gowda
8. Devappa Gowda
9. Putte Gowda
10. M. Siddalinga Setty
11. Dodda Ramiah Gowda
12. Hiriyanne Gowda
13. Manje Gowda
14. B. M. Deve Gowda
15. K. Natkallappa
16. Sarabanna
17. T. Nanjappa
18. Devappa Gowda
19. Venkatasami Gowda
20. Narayana Gowda

Messrs.

21. Channabasappa
22. Hanumanthe Gowda
23. M. Basaviah
24. Patte Basappa
25. Veerabhadrappa
26. Revanna Gowda
27. Veerasanjiva Gowda
28. S. Lingappa
29. G. Kanchappa
30. K. Parasiviah
31. Balappa
32. S. Thimme Gowda
33. Krishniah
34. J. C. Rudrappa
35. Ramaiya
36. Channappa Setty
37. Hanume Gowda
38. Veere Gowda
39. Linge Gowda
40. Channappa

Messrs.

41. B. Venkatappa
42. Halegowda
43. Appajappa Gowda
44. Joganna Gowda
45. B. Linge Gowda
46. M. C Linge Gowda
47. H. C. Dasappa
48. Khan Bahadur Md. Abbas Khan.
49. D. S. Mallappa
50. Rayappa
51. H Basappa
52. D. Banumaiya
53. H. B. Gundappa
54. Papanna
55. P. Channabasappa
56. G. Muniyappa
57. Malkappa
58. B. P. Basappa Setty
59. Mahadevappa
60. Vema Reddy
61. G. K. Mallappa
62. Chinnobaiya
63. P. Avalakonda Reddy
64. Chikkananja Reddy
65. Mir Raza Ali
66. Lalkhan Saheb
67. Abdul Nabi
68. Byra Reddy
69. Doddaiya
70. Hanume Gowda
71. O. V. Rajagopal
72. S. P. Brahmappa
73. B. Nanjundaiya Setty
74. Venkatappa
75. B. S. Puttaswami
76. Mahomed Sait

Messrs.

77. B. Deva Gowda
78. Sidde Gowda
79. Manjiah
80. Thimme Gowda
81. Kapani Gowda
82. Channappa
83. Muniswamappa
84. S. Munivenkatappa
85. K. N. Puttanna
86. Sangana Basappa
87. Gurikar Nanjappa
88. Puttananjappa
89. Sivalingappiah
90. Settara Siddappa
91. N. Gurulingappa
92. Patel Basappa
93. Guruvappa
94. Mahalingappa
95. Hanumaiya
96. Kempanna
97. Venkataramana Gowda
98. G. Hanumappa
99. Murugiappa
100. Yajaman Siddappa
101. Murugappa
102. Basettappa
103. Yusuf Khan
104. Bacha Saheb
105. Mallappa
106. O. Channabasappa
107. Patel Mahadevappa
108. P. Linge Gowda
109. Huchuvecregowda
110. Bale Gowda
111. Puttasami Gowda
112. S. C. Malliah
113. Nanjappa Setty

At this stage, THE DEWAN said that Mr. S. C. Malliah had given notice of an adjournment motion to discuss the procedure followed in selecting candidates for admission to the Survey Training Class recently opened in Bangalore, that the allegations made in the motion were to the effect that sufficient number of non-Brahmin candidates had not been selected, that some non-Mysoreans also had secured admission and that the arrangements made should be cancelled. He called upon the Survey Superintendent to explain the matter to the members in detail.

THE SUPERINTENDENT, REVENUE SURVEY, explained that the Department was in need of trained hands for work

connected with the Record of Rights which had been ordered to be introduced immediately in three taluks and which would be extended to other taluks as well in course of time ; that Government sanctioned the opening of a training class for a batch of 60 students with S.S.L.C. qualifications to undergo a course of training in the methods of survey work, etc. ; that applications were invited from duly qualified young men for admission into the class by means of an advertisement published in the *Mysore Gazette* on the 12th April 1928; that 248 applications were received in response to it, of which 50 were rejected, and that out of the balance of 198, there were only 7 non-Brahmin candidates who were all selected. The remaining candidates happened to be all Brahmins and 53 of them were also selected to make up the required number. He assured the Assembly that the selection was confined to the best qualified among the Brahmins.

The Survey Superintendent added that with the extension of the scheme of Record of Rights into the remaining taluks, as many as 400 to 500 additional hands would be required and that, as there was a feeling that more non-Brahmin students should be selected, it would be possible to do so in future selections.

He further added that no non-Mysorean was selected and that of those selected, 59 were Mysoreans by birth and one by domicile.

In reply to Mr. D. S. Mallappa the Survey Superintendent said that the advertisement did not pass through the Central Recruitment Board as there was no order to do so. He added that it was not necessary to advertise through the Recruitment Board in the case of candidates for admission to the training class.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA pointed out that the admission in the case under consideration was equivalent to eventual employment and that the matter should have been referred to the Central Recruitment Board.

THE DEWAN promised to bear the point in mind in selecting future batches of candidates.

In reply to Mr. S. C. Malliah, THE SURVEY SUPERINTENDENT said that although the advertisement was meant to be published in two issues of the *Mysore Gazette*, it was published only once with the result already stated by him.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA argued that with better advertisement a larger number of non-Brahmin candidates would have applied and as the Central Recruitment Board was

not also consulted, the arrangements already made should be cancelled and fresh applications invited through the Recruitment Board.

THE DEWAN said that that could not be done at that stage and that in connection with the next batch of students, if more non-Brahmin candidates applied, selection could be made out of them. He also added that non-Brahmin candidates did not seem to care for such small appointments involving laborious work and not commensurate pay.

MR. C. P. BASAPPA SETTY and several others pointed out that the representation of non-Brahmins in the service was not proportionate to their numerical strength and that the procedure adopted in the present instance gave 53 appointments to one minor community while only seven were given to the major communities. This was, they thought, quite against the spirit of the order on the Miller Committee Report.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA thought that as the advertisement was published somewhere in the middle of the *Mysore Gazette* instead of at the end along with the advertisements of the Recruitment Board, it evidently missed the attention of the candidates with the result that very few non-Brahmins applied. In these circumstances, he was also of opinion that the arrangements already ordered should be cancelled and fresh applications invited.

THE DEWAN again repeated that arrangements already ordered could not be cancelled and that all necessary action could be taken in connection with the selection of the next batch.

At this stage the Assembly rose for lunch and re-assembled at 3-30 P.M.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA, referring to the adjournment motion, said that the action of the Survey Superintendent frustrated the very object of the order on the Miller Committee Report and that unless drastic action was taken in one or two instances, such things would always occur. He added that when it was known that the non-Brahmin candidates had not applied in sufficiently large numbers, it was the plain duty of the Superintendent to have re-advertised the notice in the Gazette as well as in the newspapers. As this was not done, he contended that the arrangements already made should be cancelled and fresh applications invited again.

MESSRS. B. LINGE GOWDA and D. S. MALLAPPA empha-

sised that the order on the Miller Committee Report should be strictly enforced, as already promised by the Dewan. They said that the Survey Training Class was opened with the object of finding employment to some of the unemployed and as such, the Superintendent had no choice except to closely follow the procedure laid down by the Recruitment Rules. It was not clear why, instead of publishing the advertisement in the Gazette a second time in accordance with the rules, the Survey Superintendent was content with one publication only. They thought that suitable disciplinary action against the erring officer was called for in this instance.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH pressed that this motion should be accepted.

THE DEWAN was not prepared to go behind the selection already made. It was possible, he said, to equalise the representation of the non-Brahmin candidates in the future batches as 60 more candidates would be selected a few months thereafter and in all probability three more batches might be required. He assured the Assembly that the future advertisements would be published through the Central Recruitment Board, as desired.

In reply to Mr. Malliah's request that the sense of the Assembly should be ascertained, The Dewan said that he agreed to the principle emphasised by the non-official members and that no purpose would be served by putting the motion to vote. It was also pointed out that there was no motion before the House and that the matter was being discussed as a representation. He laid stress on the point that there was no question of 'going back on the selections already made and that such of the candidates as came out successful would be taken into the service.

In answering Mr. H. C. Dasappa's query whether what was done by the Survey Superintendent was right, The Dewan said that the whole position had been explained to him by the Superintendent and that the actual selection was made under definite instructions from Government and as such the responsibility in the matter was that of the Government and not of the Head of the Department.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH and others again pointed out that their contention was that the procedure adopted by the officer was contrary to the standing orders and that he was wrong in not giving publicity to the advertisement, at least twice in the Gazette.

THE DEWAN replied that he was not prepared to admit

that charge as the officer had acted in good faith under instructions from Government. He was sorry that one section of the House was not inclined to see the view point of Government, in spite of the explanation furnished.

Thereupon the motion was put to vote. As 116 members voted in favour of it, the sense of the Assembly was taken to be in favour of the adjournment motion.

THE DEWAN said that, as already announced by him, this vote would not influence the Government so far as the class already opened was concerned.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

MR. SIDDE GOWDA *alias* APPAJI GOWDA, Chennapatna (Rural).—

Q.—1. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(1) the number of motor accidents that occurred in the State during the current year ;

(2) the number of persons that died and the number injured ;

(3) whether the Government are satisfied that only licensed persons drive motors ;

(4) whether only trained drivers are driving the motors ;

(5) whether any action is being taken to minimise such accidents.

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, LAW DEPARTMENT.—

A.— 1. (1) 96.

(2) 26 died, 119 injured.

(3) No instance of any motor vehicle being driven by an unlicensed driver has come to the notice of Government.

(4) Yes.

(5) Buses are periodically subjected to inspection. Excess speed and over-loading are checked at all roadside stations and by surprise visits. Timings have been fixed for arrival at important places to prevent competition and reckless driving. Where the accident is found to be due to the rash or negligent act of the driver, action has been taken to cancel his license and to prosecute him. In some cases the permits of the proprietors have also been suspended with a view to induce the owners of buses to employ better class of drivers and enforce better discipline in the service of the buses.